

gross injustice of the imputations which have been cast upon the motives of those who have been instrumental in bringing it about.

It cements the Republican party, and gives unity and permanence to its organization. This may from henceforth be regarded as the controlling party of the country; for no matter who is President, it will, directly or indirectly, control the legislation of the nation until slavery ceases to be a party question in Congress.

There is yet another point at view, however, from which this election may be contemplated, which is far more interesting and significant than any we have yet suggested. It adds another bright link to the chain of evidence, which, during the last ten years, has been forcing, to prove that loyalty to principles, in politics as in everything else, is ultimately to triumph, against whatever odds. It is not quite ten years since the Democracy New York united in a common resistance to the extension of slavery, and revolted from the national organization. Of the men who figured conspicuously in that movement, and who had sufficient courage and faith in Providence to adhere to their convictions, twelve are, or have been since that period, elected to the United States Senate. It is pleasant to enumerate their names, for every one of them deserves a civic crown. They are:

King, of New York.
Sumner, of Massachusetts.
Wilson, of Massachusetts.
Hale, of New Hampshire.
Foster, of Connecticut.
Dixon, of Connecticut.
Wade, of Ohio.
Chandler, of Michigan.
Doddridge, of Wisconsin.
Harlan, of Iowa.

To the list we should add Chase, of Ohio, who has been elected, and served one Senatorial term since 1848, and who is now Governor of the State. Here we have twelve members of the upper branch of the Federal Legislature, and a very considerable portion of the whole body, selected from the ranks of a party which did not carry a single State in 1848, and which has since been deserted by its leader and most influential followers. The most creditable and enviable honors within the gift of the Northern States since that period have fallen upon this little band; and with an inexorable justice, which cannot contemplate without a certain feeling of awe, none of those who deserted has received any similar expression of public approval. This fact is the more remarkable, as not one of the twelve who have been elected were candidates for the Senate during or subsequent to the revolt of 1848, until the canvass at which they were elected. There is a moral in all this, worth more than the personal success or public service of many Senators. May it not be lost on those to whom it is addressed.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1857.

The office of the *National Era* is removed to the newly-erected "Republican Building," corner of Indiana avenue and Second street.

Mr. SEWARD'S SPEECHES.—The three speeches of Mr. Seward, delivered during the late Presidential canvass, good for all times and all places, are about to be issued in pamphlet form. We print this week the second, and next, shall give place to the third one.

REVENUE will appear after the adjournment of Congress, whose proceedings occupy too much space to admit of such discussions at the present time.

THE NATIONAL GAZETTE is the title of a new weekly German paper, in Washington, lately commenced by Magnus Gross, editor. It endorses the Cincinnati platform, is recommended by the National Democratic Committee, and is to be a supporter of Mr. Buchanan's Administration. Executive patronage will undoubtedly be extended to it.

Mr. Gross is a man of ability, but he will find it no easy task to reconcile the antagonisms of the propagation of slave insurrection and the maintenance of Democracy.

MR. BUCHANAN AND MR. FORNEY.—Mr. Wagoner, of the Buchanan members of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, in a recent speech, referred to the interference of Mr. Buchanan, and to the support of Mr. Forney, and to the following letter:

"WILKESBORO, Jan. 7, 1857.
"My DEAR SIR: I have been very much refrained from interfering in the choice of Senators by the Legislature, yet the highly confidential relations which a Pennsylvania President ought to sustain to the Pennsylvania Senate at the present moment, induce me to say a few words to you as a valued friend on the pending Senatorial election. I have no doubt that you have been expressed as to my preference among the candidates, and although my opinion may be entitled to little weight, I do not desire to be placed in an equivocal position on this, or any other subject. When asked, I have always said I preferred Mr. Forney, and I should esteem it a friendly act toward myself for any person in or out of the Legislature to support him. At the same time, I desire to express my warm personal and political regard for Messrs. Robinson, Foster, Backus, and Wright. From the course pursued by Mr. Brodhead for some years past, confidential relations between him and myself have been severed, and I should deem it a friendly act toward myself for any person in or out of the Legislature to support him. If you should deem it necessary, you may speak my sentiments to such persons as may consider them of any value.
"From your friend, very respectfully,
"Henry S. Mott, Esq."

This is the second letter of the kind, showing Mr. Buchanan's active interference in the election. It is unfortunate for the President elect, as showing him to be too closely identified with a class of politicians not at all acceptable to a large portion of his adherents, and as betraying a want of sagacity. To commence his career by sowing the seeds of faction in his own State, is not statesmanship.

The *Richmond Whig* takes occasion to allude to the President elect in the national must not be permitted to become national; that it is and must be purely a personal affair; that Mr. Forney has no special claims on the National Democratic party; that Mr. Buchanan has done quite enough for him, and should now suffer him quietly to drop. Rather unkind to a man who has stood so long and so unflinchingly by the interests of slavery!

ORGANS.—Mr. Appleton, of Maine, is to be the editor of the *Washington Union* on the accession of Mr. Buchanan. This selection of a confidential organ is said to be rather displeasing to some of the Southern men. Several of our Southern exchanges are not a little disgusted now at the idea of organists. It is said that a new and an independent Administration paper, to be called the *Times*, will be started here; and the rumor is, that Major Heise, Mr. Welsh, and Simon Cameron, are concerned in the project. It will represent, presume, the progressive "filibustering" section of the Party—the section that sympathizes with the grand efforts for the regeneration of Central America and ultimate annexation of Cuba.

THE NATIONAL THEATRE, of Washington, was destroyed by fire on the 6th instant. Only portions of the walls were left standing.

THE LONG BRIDGE has been so much damaged by the freshet, that travel across it is stopped. The result will be, diminished supplies in our markets, and increase of prices for a time.

FREE AND SLAVE SOCIETY—EDUCATION.

Nothing is easier than to deceive the People of the South in regard to the effects of Slavery. Naturally prepossessed in favor of a system under which they have been brought up, with which their pecuniary interests are identified, which constitutes the very frame-work of their society, they are apt to accept without examination, all arguments in its support; so that the Pro-Slavery press in its dissertations is not obliged to be either logical or correct. It may assert what it pleases, and the bolder its assertions, the more popular. It may get up statistical tables, on their face quite correct, but in fact presenting exceptional aspects, and conveying utterly false impressions. What of that? Nothing can surpass the credulity of the fanaticism of Slavery.

The Anti-Democratic papers of the South, having no special motive to withhold the truth, and driven on by party considerations to discredit the Democratic Party which rules the South, and to prescribe its legislation generally, from time to time breaks out in lamentation over the want of enterprise and prosperity that which. A few days since, the *Richmond (Va.) Whig* complained that the "internal improvements of the State are feebly prosecuted," and "its institutions of learning and great interests of education are languishing for want of support and encouragement." Its neighbor, the *Enquirer*, admonishes it that such statements are common among Black Republicans, but do not baffle a Virginia editor. To the fanaticism of the North should be left the ungracious task of disparaging Virginia; her own sons should repel, not countenance the libel. It proceeds to disprove the assertions of the *Whig*, in a style characteristic of the modern school of Pro-Slavery literature.

"Neither will the charge that our institutions of learning are languishing for want of support and encouragement," bear the scrutiny of an impartial investigation. It is just about twelve months since, in arguing this proposition, with the *New York Tribune*, we demonstrated that, in proportion to white population, Virginia was ahead of any other State in the number of persons who receive a collegiate education. Unless the *Whig* means to maintain that the New England free-school system of "little learning" (which both poetry and philosophy condemn in the words of a Pope and a Bacon, and which our own experience shows to be pernicious in the last degree) is superior to that more thorough and complete instruction which Virginia initiated, and is so nobly prosecuting, it must abandon the charge that the interests of the South are in a declining state. The magnificent endowment of our University and Military Institute, and the liberal provision made for the instruction of indigent scholars, prove the injustice of the accusation."

We did not notice that demonstration referred to, but we should like to see the data produced. Has any census ever shown how many persons in each State of the Union have received full college education? Are there any statistics of the kind on record? Let us remind the *Enquirer* that such a demonstration as it speaks of, must have some better ground than the returns of the alumni or students of the various colleges. The alumni of the colleges of Massachusetts in 1856 numbered 9,404, those of Virginia 9,528; the college students of Massachusetts 807, of Virginia 1,174—but how many of all were from other States? The returns furnish no data for estimating the number of college students in proportion to the population of each State. If the *Enquirer* could obtain the annual catalogues of all the colleges in both States from their foundations, and prepare accurate lists of all Massachusetts men and Virginians, college bred, it might then try its hand at such a demonstration.

What the *Enquirer* intends to show, we presume, is, that the colleges of Virginia are languishing for want of support and encouragement, because they contain more students than those of any other State. That is true, according to the tables furnished in the *American Almanac* of 1856; and we should like to know what the *Whig* means, by alleging that they are now "languishing." Is the attendance falling off? After all that has been said in support of the colleges, it is not surprising that the parents of the children of the South are parents in thinking that better discipline and teaching are to be found in Northern colleges?

But the more important part of the *Whig's* complaint is overlooked by the *Enquirer*; or, rather, it evades it. "Its institutions of learning, and great interests of education are languishing for want of support and encouragement." This is the statement of the *Whig*. It is no answer to this, to say that there are more college bred persons in Virginia, in proportion to the white population, than in any other State; or that there are more students in her colleges. This may be true, and yet "the great interests of education" may be suffering. There may be institutions in Virginia richly endowed for the wealthy and well-to-do for the holders of slaves and land—but we must remember, that while the slaveholders of Virginia number only 55,000, the whole white population is 900,000! College education for the few, but no free-school education for the masses; for, this, Pope and Bacon, Poetry and Philosophy, to say nothing of us, the philosophers of the *Enquirer*, utterly condemn "as in the last degree pernicious!" Such a maxim may suit the sublimated condition of slave society, but will pass current in none of the benighted regions of free society.

The *Richmond Whig*, whatever the motive for making such an announcement, speaks the truth. In Virginia "the great interests of education are languishing for want of support and encouragement," and the *Enquirer* may thank itself for provoking by its sneers against free society the comparisons we are about to submit.

Virginia and Massachusetts, settled about the same time—the two leading States of the Revolution—always commanding and representative States—let us compare them in respect to the great interests of education.

Virginia contained, in 1850, a population of nearly 1,500,000; Massachusetts, 1,000,000. Five hundred thousand of the former are slaves; but, as the principal laboring population of Virginia, they ought strictly to be included in the comparison. Now, there are no colleges, academies, or free schools, for this half million of people. The means of education are denied them—with rare exceptions, they can neither read nor write. Here, then, is a fearful mass of ignorance and barbarism—one-third of the population of Virginia totally uneducated.

Can such a state of things be a night of ignorance prevail in a State, without casting shadows over all classes? Can such a mass of backward and ignorant beings exist without seriously endangering every interest?

Should we say of a State in Europe, in which a third of the whole population has no more idea of letters than the brutes with which they herd, that it is distinguished by its devotion to the great interests of education?

Massachusetts is free from this curse—she has no class of population, uneducated—her laboring people are protected in all their interests.

But, leave the slaves out of the comparison; look alone at the white population. In 1850, the whites in Massachusetts and the whites in Virginia were nearly equal in number: whites between the ages of 5 and 20, were,

In Virginia 345,265

In Massachusetts 303,920

First, let us dispose of the highest class of educational institutions:

COLLEGES.

No. of Prof.	Students.	Volumes.
Virginia 10	81,197	71,875
Massachusetts 4	53	644,131,371

Virginia has more colleges, but the University is the only one that has a general reputation; while three of the four colleges of Massachusetts—Cambridge, Amherst, and Williams—are known all over the country. As to scholarship and discipline, that is a topic not to be illustrated by figures; but it will be observed, that the libraries of the four colleges of Massachusetts contain 60,000 more volumes than those of the ten of Virginia.

THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS.

No. of Prof.	Students.	Volumes.
Virginia 3	10	119
Massachusetts 3	12	147

MEDICAL SCHOOLS.

No. of Prof.	Students.	Volumes.
Virginia 1	16	3
Massachusetts 2	11	230

LAW SCHOOLS.

No. of Prof.	Students.	Volumes.
Virginia 1	3	116
Massachusetts 1	3	108

COLLEGES, MEDICAL, THEOLOGICAL, AND LAW SCHOOLS.

No. of Prof.	Students.	Volumes.
Virginia 16	101,818	81,875
Massachusetts 10	79	1,373

It must be remarked that the Virginia colleges are supported generally by the Southern States—containing one-fifth of all the college students of the South; while the colleges of Massachusetts find powerful rivals in the other free States, and contain not more than one-ninth of the students of that section. A summary of the higher institutions of learning in free and slave States presents the following results:

COLLEGES.

No. of Prof.	Students.	Volumes.
F. S. 61	517,472	10,702
S. S. 29	490,194	147,635

LAW, MEDICINE, THEOLOGY.

No. of Prof.	Students.	Volumes.
F. S. 32	122	1,807
S. S. 32	122	1,807

A poor showing for Slave Society! But we must not forget Virginia and Massachusetts. The oldest college of the latter is Harvard, founded in 1636—that of Virginia, William and Mary, founded in 1692. The number of students in the former is now 365, in the latter, 82; the number of Alumni of the former, 6,700, of the latter, 3,000; the number of volumes in the library of the former, 101,250, of the latter, 5,000.

We have shown that even as respects the small class of persons furnished with collegiate privileges, Virginia is far behind Massachusetts, although it might be supposed that she would devote herself to the special education of that class. The contrast is more striking when we come to test their provisions for the educational interests of the masses. Recollect, the number of students in these collegiate institutions of Virginia is 1,616, in Massachusetts 1,379—and a large proportion of these from other States. But the number of white persons, in 1850, between 5 and 20, was, in the former, 345,265, in the latter, 303,920. In 1853, the number of children in Massachusetts (nearly all white) from 5 to 15, was 294,705. The returns from Virginia are always imperfect, for the ruling class objects to the *Enquirer*, and free schools are a nuisance. Certainly, however, we may estimate the number of white children in that State in 1853, at not less than 204,000. Now, what provision is made for the education of these, who are to constitute the "bone and sinew" of the State? This is the great question. Neglect them, and the "great interests of education" are sacrificed, and the State is endangered. Apos of Aristocracy may sneer at the education of the masses; but it constitutes the only basis of a stable and safe Democracy. Leave the masses in ignorance, and they become fit subjects for oppression, ready instruments to the demagogue. What, then, have Virginia and Massachusetts done for their education?

We know what the public schools are in Massachusetts—what, in Virginia. None but an ignorant would venture to compare them. Every candid man in the South knows that, as a general rule, its public schools are of a very low grade. But we are now concerned only with what authentic statistics reveal.

We quote from the census of 1850.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

No. of Prof.	Students.	Income.
Mass. 3,679	4,443	176,475
Virginia 2,930	2,997	67,353

But, it may be suggested that Virginia pays more attention to private schools and academies. Let us see. We quote from the same document.

ACADEMIES AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS.

No. of Prof.	Students.	Income.
Mass. 403	521	13,435
Virginia 317	547	9,668

TOTAL PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS.

No. of Prof.	Students.	Income.
Mass. 4,082	4,964	189,911
Virginia 3,247	3,544	77,021

The census, in summing up, puts the number of scholars in Colleges, Academies, and Public Schools, in 1850, at 19,745 in Massachusetts, and 17,764 in Virginia. Taking the returns of the white children in Massachusetts in 1850, as a basis for calculation, there were about 200,000 between the ages of 5 and 15 in each State in 1850, of whom all but a fraction were receiving an education in Massachusetts, while only 77,764 were being educated in Virginia, leaving 122,000 uneducated by the State. It is thus that Slave Society—that perfect form of civilization about which these Richmond Rhetoricians are eternally declaiming—provides for the educational interests of the masses of the People. Let us see what it has done to supply reading for the few and Many.

LIBRARIES.

No. of Vols.	Students.	Income.
Public—No. 177	257,377	32,595
School—No. 104,645	2,706	6

No. of Vols.	Students.	Income.
Sunday School—No. 433	11,975	1,975
College—No. 18	14,400	50,856
Church—No. 42	2	330
Total—No. 1,462	54	54
Vols. 684,015	89,462	

Balance for the masses in Massachusetts, 528,000 volumes; in Virginia, 37,000! After such an exhibition as this, we shall not be surprised when the census informs us that the number of native whites over twenty, unable to read and write, is, in Virginia, 75,868; in Massachusetts, 8061!

We might pursue the comparison, but we forbear. Not to disparage Virginians, do we thus write—our relations to that State constrain us to regard it with respect—besides, there is much in her history, much in the character of her People, to awaken admiration. But the school of her politicians by which she is now governed, teaches false and damnable doctrines, which the illustrious fathers of the State repudiated. They regarded Slavery as an evil, to be excused only on the plea of necessity. They believed in the rights of human nature—in the duty of the State to promote the education and elevation of the masses of its People—and they did not hold that labor degrades the man and disqualifies him for the higher duties of citizenship. The school of philosophy and politics which now prevails

in Virginia denies the principles which Jefferson proclaimed as the foundation of Government. It sneers at the Democratic idea of government of the People by the People. It believes in the domination of a class, in legislation for a class. It ridicules free society, talks of the insurrection of free labor, of the blessed time coming when the free working man in his extremity shall call for a master, and capitalists seek security for their property in the institution of Slave Society. Not against Virginia, or Virginia who hold the faith of their fathers, do we war—but against this detestable school of dogmatists and sophists, whose teachings are a disgrace to the Civilization of the Country, and an insult to Manhood. They talk of argument and facts—but when, from a census, the compendium of which has been compiled by one of their own number, you confront them with the glaring fact that their system and policy are spreading ignorance and barbarism among the masses of the white People in Slave Society, they tell you that free schools are very worthless things, and that, according to Pope and Bacon and the *Richmond Enquirer*, a little learning is a most pernicious matter!

We shall continue the subject. We shall try your dogmas by facts.

CENTRAL AMERICAN TREATY.

Although the proceedings of the Senate in Executive session are conducted with closed doors, it seems impossible to keep the public in total ignorance of their general character. Results, votes, even skeletons of speeches, find their way into the newspapers.

It seems that the Central American Treaty, which it was hoped would finally settle our controversies with Great Britain, has failed to secure the ratification of the Senate. Despatches in some of the newspapers state, that in the course of a long debate on the 4th, Mr. Mason of Virginia sustained the treaty on the grounds taken by the Administration; but that it was objected to on the assumption that the British protectorate over the Mosquito Indians was distinctly recognized, and that while the sovereignty over the Bay Islands was nominally relinquished by Britain, her authority was practically maintained. Mr. Douglas, who had been holding himself in reserve, at last opened against the treaty in a style of fierce denunciation, and finally, by a vote of 33 to 8, it was rejected. It is said that the treaty is to the treaty—that either it will not be reported again, or will be reported with amendments, so that the whole controversy will be reopened. It is further supposed that the amendments will be of such a character as to complicate the subjects in dispute, to provoke irritation in England, to arouse her pride, and prevent a peaceful adjustment. We must infer that several Republican Senators voted to recommit—why, we know not, unless, as has been hinted, to prevent the instant rejection of the treaty. Of course, not having the facts before us, we have no right to dogmatize, but it seems to us that the true policy would be to fix the responsibility upon the ruling party. Give it no chance for evasion or postponement; if possible, compel it to vote at once, yes or no. At all events, for one we should beware of reporting or abetting, even indirectly, any of its filibustering projects.

We suppose the real opposition to the Treaty springs from a disinclination to settle our controversies with England in Central America, and thus put an end to filibustering and those great movements for the regeneration of that benighted region, spoken of in the Cincinnati Resolutions. The treaty of Great Britain with Honduras, relinquishing the sovereignty of the Bay Islands, but providing for the perpetual exclusion of Slavery therefrom, was commented upon largely, it is said, and was represented as an insult to our country, and most unwarrantable attempt on the part of Great Britain to check the natural expansion of our institutions. It is easy to see how such a man as Mr. Douglas could arouse the Pro-Slavery sentiment of the Senate on the subject, and use it for the defeat of an arrangement which promised to put an end to filibustering on our Southern border. It is not likely that he is specially anxious for the introduction of Slavery into the Bay Islands, but if the *esprit de corps* of Slaveholders can be made subservient to the policy of keeping open a controversy with England, keeping open Central America for the lawless operations of "Young America," embarrassing the new Administration from the start, and subjecting it to the influence of an aspirant, who has the confidence of the real "Southern Party," as it is called, why not?

Possibly, the People who have been so much impressed by the conciliatory demonstrations of England, by her evident desire to cultivate peaceful relations with us, by her voluntary cession of the Bay Islands, the surrender of the Mosquito Protectorate, and the relinquishment of all projects of colonization in Central America, may begin to inquire whether true statesmanship does not require that we should meet her half way, and respond frankly to her overtures—whether the peaceful relations and great commercial interests of two nations so intimately allied, so necessary to the civilization of the world, should be impeded by the secret and selfish machinations of the presidential aspirants who control the Senate of the United States. Especially will they ask, what business is it of ours, if England and Honduras are to an agreement to exclude Slavery from a country, over which we have no control, to which we have never pretended a title, with which we have no more concern than Brazil? The business before the Senate is, not the England and Honduras Treaty, but the Dallas and Clarendon Treaty.

Meanwhile, let the People look to it—this thing of Slavery is obtruding itself into their concerns, everywhere and at all times, plotting its own aggrandizement, and demanding of them; and this its venture is a bold one. Slavery is a domestic question—will it be an advantage to the Propaganda, to make it a Foreign Question? Is the power of the Propaganda so well settled, that it can stand without damage the shock of a collision with Great Britain? No wonder Conservative statesmen in the South shrink from the consequences to which the schemings of the extreme men expose the country, and especially their section of it.

SENATORIAL ELECTION IN INDIANA.

The Buchanan members of the Legislature of Indiana on the 4th instant held a joint convention for the election of United States Senators. Graham N. Fitch was chosen to fill the present vacancy, and Jesse D. Bright was chosen for six years from the 4th of March next. The vote is reported, stood 83 for each.

The first statement was, that sixty members of the House, and twenty-six of the Senate were in attendance, but later despatches announce that twenty-three Senators were present, and sixty-two Representatives.

The whole proceeding is illegal, and there is no election. Both the gentlemen named, doubtless understand this.

The joint convention was invalid, because it was held without the concurrence, and in opposition to the protest, of the Senate. It had no more authority to elect Senators than an ordinary party convention. The Senate contains fifty members—twenty-six are a quorum of that body—only twenty-three Senators were

present in the convention—of course the Senate—a co-equal branch of the Legislature—was not represented, and, as Senators must be elected by the Legislature of the State, there was no election. A despatch from Indianapolis, dated 5th inst. says:

"The Senate, by a vote of seven majority, denounced the joint convention as illegal, and authorized by them, and protest against the United States Senate swearing in the Senators alleged to have been elected. The two American votes cast were given by Representatives, and not by the two American Senators, who, therefore, do we war—but against this detestable school of dogmatists and sophists, whose teachings are a disgrace to the Civilization of the Country, and an insult to Manhood. They talk of argument and facts—but when, from a census, the compendium of which has been compiled by one of their own number, you confront them with the glaring fact that their system and policy are spreading ignorance and barbarism among the masses of the white People in Slave Society, they tell you that free schools are very worthless things, and that, according to Pope and Bacon and the *Richmond Enquirer*, a little learning is a most pernicious matter!

We shall continue the subject. We shall try your dogmas by facts.

CENTRAL AMERICAN TREATY.

Although the proceedings of the Senate in Executive session are conducted with closed doors, it seems impossible to keep the public in total ignorance of their general character. Results, votes, even skeletons of speeches, find their way into the newspapers.

It seems that the Central American Treaty, which it was hoped would finally settle our controversies with Great Britain, has failed to secure the ratification of the Senate. Despatches in some of the newspapers state, that in the course of a long debate on the 4th, Mr. Mason of Virginia sustained the treaty on the grounds taken by the Administration; but that it was objected to on the assumption that the British protectorate over the Mosquito Indians was distinctly recognized, and that while the sovereignty over the Bay Islands was nominally relinquished by Britain, her authority was practically maintained. Mr. Douglas, who had been holding himself in reserve, at last opened against the treaty in a style of fierce denunciation, and finally, by a vote of 33 to 8, it was rejected. It is said that the treaty is to the treaty—that either it will not be reported again, or will be reported with amendments, so that the whole controversy will be reopened. It is further supposed that the amendments will be of such a character as to complicate the subjects in dispute, to provoke irritation in England, to arouse her pride, and prevent a peaceful adjustment. We must infer that several Republican Senators voted to recommit—why, we know not, unless, as has been hinted, to prevent the instant rejection of the treaty. Of course, not having the facts before us, we have no right to dogmatize, but it seems to us that the true policy would be to fix the responsibility upon the ruling party. Give it no chance for evasion or postponement; if possible, compel it to vote at once, yes or no. At all events, for one we should beware of reporting or abetting, even indirectly, any of its filibustering projects.

We suppose the real opposition to the Treaty springs from a disinclination to settle our controversies with England in Central America, and thus put an end to filibustering and those great movements for the regeneration of that benighted region, spoken of in the Cincinnati Resolutions. The treaty of Great Britain with Honduras, relinquishing the sovereignty of the Bay Islands, but providing for the perpetual exclusion of Slavery therefrom, was commented upon largely, it is said, and was represented as an insult to our country, and most unwarrantable attempt on the part of Great Britain to check the natural expansion of our institutions. It is easy to see how such a man as Mr. Douglas could arouse the Pro-Slavery sentiment of the Senate on the subject, and use it for the defeat of an arrangement which promised to put an end to filibustering on our Southern border. It is not likely that he is specially anxious for the introduction of Slavery into the Bay Islands, but if the *esprit de corps* of Slaveholders can be made subservient to the policy of keeping open a controversy with England, keeping open Central America for the lawless operations of "Young America," embarrassing the new Administration from the start, and subjecting it to the influence of an aspirant, who has the confidence of the real "Southern Party," as it is called, why not?

Possibly, the People who have been so much impressed by the conciliatory demonstrations of England, by her evident desire to cultivate peaceful relations with us, by her voluntary cession of the Bay Islands, the surrender of the Mosquito Protectorate, and the relinquishment of all projects of colonization in Central America, may begin to inquire whether true statesmanship does not require that we should meet her half way, and respond frankly to her overtures—whether the peaceful relations and great commercial interests of two nations so intimately allied, so necessary to the civilization of the world, should be impeded by the secret and selfish machinations of the presidential aspirants who control the Senate of the United States. Especially will they ask, what business is it of ours, if England and Honduras are to an agreement to exclude Slavery from a country, over which we have no control, to which we have never pretended a title, with which we have no more concern than Brazil? The business before the Senate is, not the England and Honduras Treaty, but the Dallas and Clarendon Treaty.

Meanwhile, let the People look to it—this thing of Slavery is obtruding itself into their concerns, everywhere and at all times, plotting its own aggrandizement, and demanding of them; and this its venture is a bold one. Slavery is a domestic question—will it be an advantage to the Propaganda, to make it a Foreign Question? Is the power of the Propaganda so well settled, that it can stand without damage the shock of a collision with Great Britain? No wonder Conservative statesmen in the South shrink from the consequences to which the schemings of the extreme men expose the country, and especially their section of it.

INDIANA AFFAIRS.

The House Legislature continues the granting of charters and privileges to companies, with great industry and disregard as to their actual value. These companies are chiefly formed by members of the Legislature.

An amusing incident occurred in the Council on the 23d inst. The subject of a company to navigate the Kaw was introduced by Mr. Rees. As usual, most of the names on it were of members of one of these legislative houses, and the name of the company was "The Kaw Navigation Company." The name was objected to, and the name was changed to "The Kaw Navigation Company."

The repeal of the twelfth section of the act relative to slavery property amounts to little or nothing, and merely relates to freedom of discussion on the slavery question while Kansas continues a Territory. It is expected that Kansas will soon be a State; hence the yielding on this point for policy.